

REMARKS

Claims 1-36 are pending in this application, of which claims 1 and 2 have been amended.

No new claims have been added.

The Examiner has rejected the claims as follows:

- 1) Claims 1-12 and 25-30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are unpatentable over **Shioji** in view of **Margerum et al.** and **Sumita** (all newly applied);
- 2) Claims 19-22 and 31-34 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are unpatentable over **Shioji** in view of **Margerum et al.** and **Sumita** and further in view of **Kinoshita** (previously applied);
- 3) Claims 13-18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over **Shioji** in view of **Margerum et al.** and **Sumita** and further in view of **Honda et al.** (previously applied);
- 4) Claims 23 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over **Shioji** in view of **Margerum et al.** and **Sumita** and further in view of **Dunn et al.** (previously applied); and
- 5) Claims 35 and 36 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over **Shioji** in view of **Margerum et al.** and **Sumita** and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,075,951 to Maruyama (hereinafter "**Maruyama**") and U.S. Patent 5,926,243 to Kim (hereinafter "**Kim**").

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Without repeating Applicants' previous discussion of the previously applied references contained in Applicants' response of January 6, 2003, it should be noted that the independent claims 1-2 were rejected based on the same combination of references, namely Shioji, Margerum et al., and Sumita, except that the base reference for the §102(a) rejection is now Shioji.

As Applicants' noted in their previous response:

It should be noted that the electrode in Shioji, which corresponds to the counter electrode of the present invention, is separated into the first common electrode 21 and the second common electrode 22, as described in Fig. 3 thereof. Further, the second common electrode 22 is opposed to the connecting region 13, which corresponds to the wiring electrode of the present invention, and the liquid crystal layer in this region is controlled with these electrodes.

On the other hand, in claims 1 and 2 of the instant application, the counter electrode is "provided over the entire area of said display area to face said signal electrode", and the counter electrode is a completely solid single body, without any notches, and is not divided, as described in page 12, lines 25-26 of the specification of the instant application and as shown in Figs. 2 and 4. The reason why such a construction can be adopted is described in page 15, lines 23-27 of the specification of the instant application. Such a simple form of the electrode is advantageous for fabrication.

The Examiner has not addressed this argument.

Accordingly, claims 1-2 has been amended to recite a single counter electrode.

It should be noted that claim 2 recites "a scattering type liquid crystal layer in which a scattering degree increases in a part to which voltage is applied" and it is not shown in any of the cited references. By using the scattering type liquid crystal layer recited in claim 2, it is enough

to provide a pattern electrode on a substrate of a liquid crystal cell. Consequently, a surrounding electrode is not necessary, thereby simplifying the structure of the electrode, as disclosed in the second embodiment (Fig. 10) of the present application.

Claims 7 and 8 are supported on page 25, fourth paragraph, of the specification and in Fig. 10. A liquid crystal display device comprising a convex lens is not disclosed in any of the cited references.

As noted in Applicants' response of January 6, 2003 regarding claims 13-18, in an interview conducted with the Examiner on October 7, 2002, the Examiner admitted that if an English translation of the PCT application has been received in the U.S.P.T.O., the international filing date of the instant application, namely, June 23, 2000 could be used to remove Honda et al. as a reference, where Honda et al. has a U.S. filing date of December 6, 2000. Such an English translation of the instant application was filed with the PCT transmittal in the U.S.P.T.O. on December 20, 2001.

As also noted in Applicants' response of January 6, 2003 regarding claims 19-22 and 31-34, Kinoshita has been cited for teaching a light intensity change means but fails to provide motivation to provide a gap between wiring electrodes and a surrounding electrode, as recited in claim 1, from which these claims depend.

However, Kinoshita discloses turning on or off the EL backlight 2 by controlling the power source 3 with the illumination control means 41 in the control circuit 4 according to signal from the optical sensor 5 detecting the quantity of ambient light, but fails to disclose controlling an intensity of transmitting light with a liquid crystal shutter, as recited in claims 21 and 22 of the

instant application.

As also noted in Applicants' response of January 6, 2003 regarding claims 23 and 24, **Dunn et al.** has been cited for teaching an ultraviolet cutting layer provided at least on one of outer surfaces of said first and second substrates of said liquid crystal display panel but, like the other cited references, fails to provide the motivation to supply a gap between wiring electrodes and a surrounding electrode, as recited in claim 1, from which these claims depend.

In the present invention, a liquid crystal display device is built into a camera. Although **Margerum** discloses that as LCD devices are well-known in consumer applications, none of the cited references teaches, mentions or suggests a specific structure for installing an LCD in a camera, as recited in claims 27-30, which are supported on page 36, third paragraph, of the specification and in Figs. 14-15.

Regarding claims 35-36, the newly-applied reference to **Kim** discloses a liquid crystal display including two substrates spaced apart from each other a predetermined distance, conductive layers formed on inner surfaces of the substrates and facing each other, a liquid crystal injected between the conductive layers, sealants for bonding the substrates together, a thermal insulation layer externally enclosing the substrates and the sealants, and polarized films each formed on external sides of the substrates with the thermal insulation layer interposed therebetween.

None of the cited newly-applied references discloses a single counter electrode provided on an entire area of the display area to force the signal electrode, as recited in the amendments to claims 1-2, from which claims 35 and 36 respectively depend.

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/926,803

Thus, all the 35 USC §103(a) rejections should be withdrawn.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, claims 1-36, as amended, are in condition for allowance, which action, at an early date, is requested.

If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

ARMSTRONG, WESTERMAN & HATTORI, LLP



William L. Brooks
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 34,129

WLB/mla
Atty. Docket No. 011701
Suite 1000
1725 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 659-2930



23850

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

H:\HOME\etitia\WLB\01\011701\amendment jun 2003